

NOTES OF MEETING

LIVERPOOL CITY REGION CLIMATE PARTNERSHIP

Thursday 30th March 2023, 4.00pm

Attendees:

Chair Gideon Ben-Tovim	Nature Connected, Climate Partnership
Vice Chair Cllr Gill Wood	Wirral BC, Climate Partnership
Rachel Waggett	LCRCA, Principal Environment Officer (meeting admin)
Archie McCluskey	LCRCA, Environment Officer
Elinor Bridges	LCRCA, Management Graduate
Annie Merry	Faiths4change
Ros Rice	Extinction Rebellion
Don Naylor	Friends of the Earth
Nick Thompson	CPRE - The Countryside Charity
Cllr Liz Grey	Wirral BC
Stephen Sykes	2030hub, Merseyside Environmental Trust, Green Drinks Liverpool, East Lancs Chamber of Commerce, St Helens Climate Change Commission
Huw Jenkins	LCRCA, Lead Officer – Transport Policy
Lesley Worswick	Merseyside Recycling and Waste Authority, Chief Executive
Cllr Paulette Lappin	Sefton BC, Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources, Compliance and Enforcement

Apologies received from:

Nicky Crosby	Extinction Rebellion
Cllr Phil Harris	Halton Council
Peter Owen	Energy Projects Plus, Chief Executive

1. Welcome and introductions/ apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed attendees and introductions were made as stated above.

2. Declarations of interest

No declarations of interest were made.

3. Notes of last meeting for agreement

Don Naylor (DN) noted that there was an error in the notes from the previous meeting, as Laura Robertson Collins appeared in apologies and attendees. Gideon Ben-Tovim (GBT) confirmed she had attended and minutes will be amended.

4. Matters arising

Rachel Waggett (RW) gave an update on the climate action plan, informing the group that herself, Archie McCluskey (AMC) and Elinor Bridges have been working through addressing approximately 730 feedback comments. Explained that work is ongoing to synthesise and streamline feedback to avoid listing similar actions with the same outcome multiple times to prevent document from being too long. Informed group that document will be shared again when process complete.

RW proposed meeting held on Teams in future rather than Zoom. RW explained that Teams has developed to become a more effective platform and some users are finding Zoom unstable.

- Nick Thompson (NT) asked if all six Local Authorities have a similar timetable for climate action as the 5 Year Action Plan and stated importance of keeping abreast of what Local Authorities are doing. RW responded that she will come back on question of timeline, and explained that Combined Authority meets fortnightly with Local Authorities to share learning and experience. RW noted that authorities taking different approaches, and align but don't necessarily duplicate.
- NT asked about presentation shared at the last Climate Partnership. Heading 5.2 Clean Energy, page 6 – discussion about solar panels and talk of a heat map, which would be very useful for different groups, particularly identifying location of renewable energy i.e. solar panels. NT requested clarification of what this means and how the map can be accessed. RW responded that it is still evolving and being delivered by Net Zero Hub colleagues, and will request an update from them.
- DN asked about the notes circulated for today, and queried whether they should have included presentations from last month as it would be helpful to have the slides to digest the content. Related to this, DN also noted that he had been emailing with AMC about getting the notes up to date on the CA website, as they were in arrears the last time he checked. RW explained that notes are circulated to speakers before publication to ensure they have been properly represented, and they are also asked for permission to share slides. In some cases, speakers are happy to share slides, in others, they would rather not share them as all content goes on the website which means it would be publicly available. RW explained that the Investment team, who presented last time, would rather the presentation was not shared yet as it represents evolving thinking. RW explained that the web team are very busy and so notes not yet uploaded but this will be done asap.
- DN –Referring to a previous comment on Merseyside Pension Fund, DN noted that even though its not a direct issue for CA, there were several comments from the group about mechanisms the CA could use to encourage things to happen, Paulette mentioned a possible mechanism for that. Wondered if there were any updates. RW mentioned that PL recommended an individual to speak to, RW to contact and ask for a speaker.
- DN informed the group of a letter that was co-signed yesterday (29.03.23) by climate academics to the Government saying they do not feel there should be a future for new oil and gas. There were six academics from University of Liverpool, including three professors. DN stated interest in fact that, in the same letter, there were references to carbon capture and storage and how it is unproven at scale. DN raised link between this and the proposal for carbon capture storage as part of HyNet. LG commented that she also had concerns that had been raised previously. LG commented that the how and why embedding of fossil fuel use in the future economy, locally or nationally, should be investigated, and alternatives identified. RW responded that the ongoing Green Hydrogen study is investigating these issues, as carbon capture is envisaged to be a solution for a period before production of hydrogen is able to be fully electrified. RW reiterated that the preference is to reduce energy use and make energy 100% renewable. There is an understanding that carbon capture technology is currently unproven at scale and that this adds risk to the process. NT agreed and commented that it is good to see contentious national issues are not being avoided. DN thanked group for agreeing to note the letter, and noted that signatories from University of Liverpool include Professors Matthew Baylis, Andy



Morse & Richard Worden. Link to the letter here:

https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/mar/30/government-gambles-on-carbon-capture-and-storage-tech-despite-scientists-doubts?CMP=Share_AndroidApp_Other

5. Meeting content

Lesley Worswick – Merseyside Recycling and Waste Authority

- Presentation delivered as on attached slides
- NT noted that synchronisation of the 6 Local Authorities was a challenge, for example, regarding food waste. He asked if there will ever be coordination on bin colours across the six Local Authorities, and finally thanked LW for the Circular Economy Club. LW responded that food waste and synchronisation is a challenge, and partnership work is looking at options and discussing this regularly. LW noted that she believes it makes sense, due to economies of scale, but decisions will be made by collection authorities. She noted that all seem to be pulling in one direction, but the detail remains to be seen. LW was not able to comment on bins, as this is down to collection authorities, and thanked NT for kind comments on Circular Economy Club.
- DN thanked LW for presentation and noted issues of contamination of waste categories, where food gets in plastic and this can cause rejection of the recycling waste stream; is there an update on management of this? LW responded that contamination is a challenge, and it is about changing behaviour and educating people. There are problems with 'wish recycling' ie. putting waste in the recycling bin in the hope that it will be recyclable but not all plastic is. LW noted that this is a subject discussed at the LCR waste partnership, and there will be more work in future looking at contamination levels. LW commented on importance of a consistent and single voice for education and behaviour change, and brought attention to a fund where people can bid for projects in this area. LW keen to take this forward with partnership ensure all speaking with the same voice.
- DN wondered what is the stance on energy from waste, is plastic burned for energy? DN raised two concerns about this; impact on air quality and mentality that plastic isn't a concern as it can be burned which does not break cycle of use. LW was not sure on specifics of burning plastic, but noted that residual waste in LCR does go to energy from waste plant to avoid landfill. LW emphasised importance of waste minimalization and recycling.
- Ros Rice (RR) thanked LW for presentation. RR has noticed adverts on Merseyrail about not bagging recycling and emphasised its simple messages that are really important, eg. what plastics are ok to recycle. RR noted importance of moving forward as it will take the public a long time to assimilate and deal with the information. RR complimented the adverts on Merseyrail.
- Annie Merry (AM) thanked LW and noted that it would be useful to know how organisations can help to support the messaging and share it on their own social media/websites. AM reiterated importance of education and messages coming from different places and people, but questioned how to do that correctly, she suggested changing the message to a different focus month to month eg. paper followed by cans. Most contamination is due to over-zealous recycling so if people have the right information this should be solvable i.e. people want to do the right thing. LW responded that MRWA have just



recruited a new staff member on communication and so will take this comment back to the team to think about how sharing better.

- Stephen Sykes (SS) recounted similar problem with his staff at East Lancashire Chamber of Commerce, where staff complained there was no recycling and then explained difficulties of getting bins and contract. Staff complained that they had seen all bags go into the same skip, but this is because the recycling is often contaminated despite notices and regular reinforcement. SS mentioned common misconceptions eg. paper towels, and how more education and more specific messaging is required, eg. “polyethene bottles” rather than “plastic bottles”. AM agreed and commented on a large sign in Central Station that morning saying 27% of Liverpool’s recycling is contaminated.
- GBT wrapped up session, thanked LW, noted that this is an issue attendees are all interested and concerned about, and shared own experience of trying to encourage grandchildren to pick litter.

Huw Jenkins – LCRCA, Transport Policy Officer Lead

- RW and GBT introduced HJ. RW explained that the LCRCA five year plan prioritises transport as a key determination of decarbonisation, and HJ and team have been doing a great deal of work on this.
- HJ presented slides as attached.
- In the chat, NT said that it is interesting that HJ is positive about future funding decisions from government, and noted that the challenge is getting the government to reallocate funding away from road solutions.
- LG commented on lots of good work and looks forward to implementation. Asked how much of City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) will be spent on comms, as this is critical with residents but also less enlightened councillors who may feel pressured to object. LG asked if any of the money can be used for comms with public and councillors, eg. workshops, and acknowledged that this is expensive but important and enabling. HJ commented that this is a good question, but CRSTS is capital funding which is for delivery, rather than behavioural or educational work. HJ explained a certain amount of consultation, engagement and comms can be funded, but by and large funding is for delivery. LG noted that LCRCA works with hospital trusts to tie in with their behavioural campaigns, and asked if we can do more to bring in revenue money. HJ explained that it is a challenge, as behavioural comms will be funded by exception however he will ask the delivery team about levels of spend allowed on consultation/behavioural aspects.
- RR thanked HJ, and explained that she is part of a car sharing group with some friends, but the barrier is having the car insured, rather than the person to drive the car. RR noted that this doesn’t belong on this forum, but raised as a practical restriction on being able to use other people’s cars when you want to. HJ expressed big hopes for car clubs because this would be a way to overcome such issues and encourage car sharing. RR also referred to images used in HJ’s presentation as positive examples of pedestrianisation, eg. Trafalgar Square, and noted that while this is lovely this is not where people live, and people are getting upset on West Derby Road and Kingsley Road because of the adjustments that have been made such as temporary cycle lanes. RR noted it’s helpful to cyclists but if it upsets the local community who live there, it is self-defeating and people are getting nasty, so the education is needed, not just infrastructure without bringing people on board.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DN thanked HJ and asked about the upgrade of the rail facilities towards Skelmersdale and Wigan – evidently there is a section of single track running due to the construction of the motorway which may prevent future expansion of Merseyrail. DN expressed hope that this will not impede uptake of battery-operated trains. DN also questioned the provision of cycle infrastructure around the new Headbolt Lane rail station – whilst there are up-to-date parallel crossings, there is still no prioritisation of continuity, with guard rails on corners and cars coming out of side roads still have priority. He notes that delivery on the ground lags behind current policy and guidance, and wonders if this is an education issue. HJ noted that there is an education issue around new standards, and lanes can't just stop where they get difficult as this is not compliant. HJ explained that the conditions of CRSTS make it clear that if walking and cycle routes are not built to the required standard, with continuous cycle routes and segregation, the government can draw the money back therefore it is in everyone's interests to get it right. DN asked if it is recognised that there is a shortfall in infrastructure at Headbolt Lane, how is that altered, will it be Knowsley or Merseytravel? HJ said he would take that back to colleagues delivering the scheme and report back. • NT noted in chat that education is again the key, and explained recent rejection by the local community in Waterloo for a new cycle way was very depressing even after the support from Simon O'Brien [LCR Cycling and Walking Commissioner]. • GBT thanked HJ and noted that the transport element of the 5 Year Climate Action Plan is well-integrated now, and noted importance of collaboration. 	
<p>Meeting close: GBT thanked all and reminded of next meeting dates.</p>	
<p>6. AOB</p>	
<p>None</p>	
<p>7. Next Meetings</p>	
<p>25th May</p>	
<p>29th June</p>	
<p>20th July</p>	